A ( )

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

Under the Pa	perwork Reduction Act of 1995	. no persons are required to	U.S respond to a o	<ol> <li>Patent and T collection of infe</li> </ol>	rademark Offi ormation unle	ce; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE is it displays a valid OMB control number.	
OIPE	Application I	Number	09/452,328				
/ TR	Filing Date		November	November 30, 1999			
iiii n a anns	<b>餅ORM</b>	First Named	Inventor	Porter	, <u></u>		
301 0 0 2000	H	Art Unit		2153			
(to be used for	Examiner Na	ame	Johnson, M	Johnson, Marlon			
Total Number of	Pages in This Submission	Attorney Doo	ket Number	112076-13	8323		
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)  After Allowance Communication to TC							
Fee Trans	mittal Form Drawing(s)					peal Communication to Board	
	Licensing-relate	censing-related Papers			Appeals and Interferences		
Amendme	Petition		~		peal Communication to TC peal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
A1		retition to Convert to a rovisional Application		Pro	prietary Information		
☐ AI		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			itus Letter		
	<u>                                   </u>				Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify		
Extension				L be	ow): eceipt Postcard		
Express A		·		İ			
Information	on Disclosure Statement	CD, Number of	CD(s)				
Landscape Table on CD							
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)  Remarks							
Reply to Missing Parts/							
Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts							
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53							
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
rirm Name	Firm Name Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.						
Signature Kal H. 7							
Printed name Kyle H. Flindt							
Date	July 6, 2005		-	Reg. No.	42,539		
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING							
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:							
Signature Musicaden							
Typed or printed i	name Yverte L. Chrisca		<del></del>		Da	te July 6, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Attorney Docket Ref: 112076-138323



# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

e Application for:

Porter

Application No.: 09/452,328

Filed: November 30, 1999

For: Dynamic Content Based

Information Browsing

Examiner: Johnson, Marlon

Art Group: 2153

#### **CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this date: July 6, 2005

Typed or Printed: Yvette L. Chrispaden

Signature:

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Appellant's Answer to Examiner's Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.193
In Support Of Appellant's Appeal To The Board Of Patent Appeals And Interferences

Dear Sir:

The Appellant hereby submits this Answer to Examiner's Response mailed May 6, 2005, to further their appeal filed August 13, 2004, from a final decision by the Examiner. The final decision was mailed on May 13, 2004 in response to arguments filed on March 1, 2004. Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for allowance of the present patent application.

### (1) Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is Hall Aluminum, LLC, having its primary place of business at 171 Main St. #271, Los Altos, California 94022.

#### (2) Related Appeals And Interferences

To the best of Appellant's knowledge, there are no appeals or interferences related to the present appeal, which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision.

#### (3) Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-42 were rejected in the Final Office Action dated May 13, 2004. Claims 1-42 remain pending were reproduced, as pending, in Appendix A of the previously filed Appeal Brief.

# (4) Status of Amendments

No claim amendments have been made since the mailing date of the final rejection.

# (5) Summary of the invention

The present invention improves information browsing. Embodiments of the present invention augment an information page being browsed with source identifiers

directly identifying additional information pages. The augmenting source identifiers are generated based at least in part on the content of the information page being browsed; and the content of the directly identified additional information pages directly augment the content of the information page based on which the augmenting source identifiers are generated.

#### (6) Issues Presented

- Whether claims 1, 2, 6-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37 and 39-41 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102.
- II. Whether claims 3-5, 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38 and 42 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103

# (7) Grouping of claims

For purpose of this appeal, based on the above listed grounds of rejection, all claims 1-42 stand or fall together.

# (8) Answer to Examiner's Response

- (A) Applicant respectfully draws the Board's attention to the fact that Applicant did indicate claims 1-48 stand and fall together in section (7) of the Appeal Brief, and reconfirmed that indication above.
- (B) In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner stated on page 13 of the Answer

"In regards to question a), information return from the server to the browser constitute a 'page' regardless of how the server generated it. Niemi's 'answer' page (the list of hyper-links, col. 7, lines 14-17) contains a list of hyper-links to related documents and indications of the degree of similarity to the downloaded page. The 'answer' page clearly augments the information page by identifying related documents and the degree of similarity of the related documents to the downloaded page."

Respectfully, the question postulated by Applicant is not whether Niemi's 'answer' page augments the information page, but whether Niemi's 'answer' page is the augmenting information page required by the independent claims, as the claim language did not merely require an augmenting information page, but a specific type of augmenting information page that contains "second contents directly augmenting the first content".

As argued in the brief, Niemi's 'answer' page contains links to documents that contain similar content, these links of 'answer' page are not "second contents directly augmenting the first content". Accordingly, they are not the required direct augmenting information page.

The Examiner further stated on pages 13 and 14 that

"In regards to question b), at col. 5, lines 10-17, Neimi teaches that the web page is augmented wherein when an keywords are identified, the HTML code is modified "on-the-fly" to introduce associated hyper-links (information source identifiers as required by claim 1). Niemi teaches that the augmented hyper-links when clicked on causes the Web browser to request from the server the contents identified by a particular URL (col. 6, lines 33-50). Hence the augmented URL "directly identifies an information page ..."

Respectfully, the claim language does not merely call for source identifiers directly identifying information pages, but source identifiers directly identifying information pages with second content that directly augment the first content.

As argued in the brief, since Neimi merely teaches augmenting the original information page with "queries" that return an answer page (when one is selected), containing links to documents with similar content (that may be retrieved on selection of

the links), these queries are not information page identifiers that directly identify information pages with second content that directly augment the first content.

Applicant's invention, when compared to Neimi, advantageously removes one

operation from the process, allowing a user to get to the useful augmenting information

with one less process operation.

(9) Conclusion

Appellant respectfully submits that all appealed claims in this application are

patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule

the Examiner's decision, and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

(10) Epilogue

For the Board's convenience, this reply is also submitted in triplicate. We do not

believe any other fees, in particular extension of time fees, are needed. However,

should any fee be necessary for this filing, please charge our Deposit Account No.

500393. In addition, please charge any shortages and credit any overages to the same

account.

Respectfully submitted, Appellant Applicant

Dated: <u>July 6, 2005</u>

By Al AuYeung, Reg. No. 35,432

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Attorney for Appellant Applicant

5